CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	☐ Fo	orce		Discourt.	U.S.
Isaac Forman		Squad #7	201802628	☑ A	buse		O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:	•	Pre	cinct:	18 N	Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Tuesday, 04/03/2018 5:55 PM		Outside of 347 6th Avenue 06		06	10/	/3/2019	10/3/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported	: D	ate/Time	Recei	ved at CCF	RB
Wed, 04/04/2018 7:48 AM		CCRB	On-line website	W	ed, 04/04	4/2018	7:48 AM	[
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addre	ess					
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command					
1. POM Robert Eysel	03057	954783	006 PCT					
2. POM Michael Collarini	00964	953767	006 PCT					
Officer(s)	Allegati	on			Inve	stigat	or Recon	nmendation
A.POM Robert Eysel	Abuse: Police Officer Robert Eysel stopped the vehicle in which \$87(2)(b) was an occupant.							
B.POM Michael Collarini	Abuse: Police Officer Michael Collarini stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) was an occupant.							
C.POM Robert Eysel	Abuse: Police Officer Robert Eysel searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) was an occupant.							
D.POM Robert Eysel	Abuse: Police Officer Robert Eysel questioned \$87(2)(b)							
E.POM Robert Eysel	Abuse: Police Officer Robert Eysel frisked §87(2)(b)							
F.POM Michael Collarini	Abuse: F	Police Officer Michael C	ollarini frisked ^{§ 87(2)}	(b)				

Case Summary

On April 4, 2018, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via the on-line website. On April 3, 2018, at approximately 5:55pm, \$87(2)(6) was driving in the vicinity of 4th Street and 6th Avenue in Manhattan when he was stopped by PO Robert Eysel and PO Michael Collarini of the 6th Precinct (Allegations A and B-Abuse of Authority: \$87(2)(6) failed to provide his driver's license, PO Eysel asked \$87(2)(b) to step out of the vehicle. PO Eysel then searched § 87(2)(b) vehicle (Allegation C-Abuse of Authority:). While he was searching the vehicle, PO Eysel allegedly asked § 87(2)(b) you have any weapons or anything I should know about?" (Allegation D-Abuse of Authority:). PO Eysel and PO Collarini then frisked \$87(2)(5) (Allegations E and F-Abuse of Authority: § 87(2)(9)). § 87(2)(b) then informed the officers that he had lost his driver's license and provided his name and date of birth to PO Eysel. PO Eysel conducted a database search on his department phone that confirmed §87(2)(b) identity and that he had a valid driver's license. \$87(2)(b) was not issued any summonses as a result of this incident. § 87(2)(g) **Findings and Recommendations** Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Robert Eysel stopped the vehicle in which was an occupant. Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Michael Collarini stopped the vehicle in was an occupant. It is undisputed that PO Eysel and PO Collarini stopped \$87(2)(b) in his vehicle. testified that he first observed PO Eysel and PO Collarini in their unmarked motor vehicle while parked in the vicinity of 3rd Street and 6th Avenue. §87(2)(b) pulled out of his parking spot in his blue sedan and onto 3rd Street travelling towards 6th Avenue. §87(2)(b) testified that there were no mechanical issues with his vehicle and that he has 35% tints on all his windows, other than the front windshield. As §87(2)(b) pulled out of his spot, the unmarked police vehicle followed. [887(2)(b)] made a right hand turn onto 6th Avenue, changed one lane to the left, then stopped at a red light at 4th Street and 6th Avenue. Immediately after the light turned green, the unmarked police vehicle's lights and sirens sounded and § 87(2)(b) immediately pulled over near the corner of 4th Street and 6th Avenue. §87(2)(b) he signaled when pulling out of his parking spot, when making the right onto 6th Avenue, and when changing lanes on 6th Avenue. He testified that he did not commit any traffic infractions. PO Eysel approached the driver's side and (\$87(2)(6)) asked him why they had stopped him. PO Eysel told \$87(2)(6) that he was pulled over because he did not signal while pulling out of his parking spot, his headlights were not on, and because his windows were tinted. [397(2)5] testified that his headlights were on while he was driving (BR 01). PO Eysel testified that he first observed 887(2)(b) vehicle travelling northbound on 6th Avenue in the vicinity of 4th Street. PO Eysel observed \$87(2)(b) change lanes towards the Page 2

observed this. He could not recall if there were any vehicles between them. PO Eysel couldn't recall if he relayed his observation to his partner. PO Eysel testified that they were stopping satisfies because he failed to signal his lane change which is a moving violation. There was no additional reason they were stopping satisfies (BR 02).	
PO Collarini's testimony was largely consistent with that of PO Eysel. He testified that he also observed change lanes without signaling. He further testified that the decision to stop was made by both officers. S87(2)(b) failing to signal when changing lane was the sole reason for the stop (BR 03).	es
Despite the observed moving violation and 887(2)(5) not having his identification, no summonses were issued. The officers used their discretion not to issue any summonses.	
§ 87(2)(g)	
Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Robert Eysel searched the vehicle in which 887(2)(b) was an occupant. Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Robert Eysel questioned 887(2)(b) 887(2)(9)	
which \$87(2)(b) was an occupant. Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Robert Eysel questioned \$87(2)(b)	
which 887(2)(b) was an occupant. Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Robert Eysel questioned 887(2)(b) 887(2)(g)	r's en

did not provide it. §87(2)(b) did not address PO Eysel's requests and only responded
by questioning whether PO Eysel was a police officer. While this was going on, §87(2)(b) was
moving his arms, reaching around the vehicle. PO Eysel couldn't recall specifically where or
what he was reaching for. PO Eysel testified that \$87(2)(b) failure to provide his ID,
questioning whether they were officers, and him reaching around the vehicle raised PO Eysel's
suspicion that \$87(2)(b) might possess a weapon or other contraband. While inside the
vehicle, \$87(2)(b) retrieved his cellphone and called 911. PO Eysel asked \$87(2)(b) to step
out of the vehicle. PO Eysel couldn't recall whether he or \$87(2)(b) opened the driver's door.
He also couldn't recall if he reached inside the vehicle and opened the door from the inside.
\$87(2)(b) complied with stepping out of the vehicle. After \$87(2)(b) was out of the vehicle, PC
Eysel leaned his head into the still open driver's door. PO Eysel looked around the vehicle for
less than one minute. He testified that he was looking to see if there were any weapons or
contraband in plain view. PO Eysel reiterated that he suspected that \$87(2)(6) might be in
possession of a weapon or other contraband because \$87(2)(b) was not cooperating with
providing his ID, he was questioning whether they were police officers, and he was reaching
around the vehicle. PO Eysel made no specific observations that led him to believe that weapons
or contraband may have been present in the vehicle. PO Eysel did not see anything of note inside
the vehicle. PO Eysel could not recall if he asked \$87(2)(b) if he had any weapons (BR 02).
in the had any weapons (BK 02).
PO Collarini testified that he initially approached the passenger's side of the vehicle. Though he
could not hear the conversation between PO Eysel and \$87(2)(6) he believed that it was
taking longer than normal to obtain \$87(2)(b) ID. Because of this, he went around to the
driver's side of the vehicle. When he arrived on the driver's side, PO Eysel was still asking
§ 87(2)(b) for his ID. PO Collarini also asked § 87(2)(b) to provide his ID. § 87(2)(b) was
replying by questioning whether or not they were actually police officers. Approximately one
minute after the beginning of the stop, \$87(2)(5) retrieved his cellphone, PO Collarini,
couldn't recall from where, and called 911. PO Collarini described \$87(2)(b) as nervous. He
described \$87(2)(b) as such because \$87(2)(b) was looking around and because he called
911. §87(2)(b) was not doing anything physically inside the vehicle. Both officers instructed
to step out of the vehicle and he complied. PO Collarini denied that either he or PO
Eysel reached inside the vehicle and opened the driver's door from the inside. PO Collarini
denied leaning into and searching §87(2)(b) vehicle. He couldn't recall if PO Eysel did so.
PO Collarini did not observe anything that led him to believe that §87(2)(b) might be in
possession of a weapon or contraband. PO Collarini could not recall if PO Eysel asked
§ 87(2)(b) if he had any weapons (BR 03).
An officer breaching the plane of the car doorway to reach inside the vehicle, even if to obtain a
better visual of the interior of the car, does constitute a search of that vehicle. An officer may
search a vehicle only if there is probable cause that it contains contraband, weapons, or evidence
of a crime. People v. Hernandez, 238 A.D.2d 131(1997) (BR 04).
§ 87(2)(g)

Page 4

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Robert Eysel frisked Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Michael Collarini frisked While 87(2)(6) While 87(2)(6) While 87(2)(6)
Collarini frisked him, PO Eysel testified that PO Collarini did so. § 87(2)(9)
testified that after PO Eysel finished searching the vehicle, he patted the outside of front and back pants pockets. PO Eysel then patted around waistline. **87(2)(b) testified that he was wearing black jeans, a white t-shirt, and a black jacket with two front pockets. He testified that he did not have anything in any of his pockets, nor around his waistband. The frisk lasted approximately three to four seconds (BR 01).
PO Eysel testified that after \$87(2)(b) stepped out of the vehicle, both officers placed him into handcuffs. Both he and PO Collarini then frisked \$87(2)(b) PO Eysel patted the right side of upper body and waistline, then his right arm and right leg, down to his ankle. PO Collarini patted the same areas on \$87(2)(b) left side. PO Eysel testified that \$87(2)(b) was frisked for the officers' safety as well as that of any pedestrians in the area. PO Eysel was generally suspicious of \$87(2)(b) for the same reasons stated above. When asked if he believed \$87(2)(b) might be in possession of a weapon, PO Eysel testified that he was not sure but that he believed it was possible. He did not make any specific observations that led him to believe that \$87(2)(b) was in possession of a weapon and could not recall observing any bulges on \$87(2)(b) person (BR 02).
PO Collarini testified that, because the officers placed strong into handcuffs, he believed that procedurally they would have frisked him. However, he testified that he could not recall if he or PO Eysel frisked PO Collarini did not observe anything that led him to believe that strong was in possession of a weapon. PO Eysel did not communicate observations that suggested such either (BR 03).
Neither officer filled out a Stop, Question, and Frisk Report, nor did either reference the frisk in their memo book entries regarding this incident. Thus, the frisk and its justification was

undocumented.

A frisk is authorized when the member of the service reasonably suspects the person is armed and dangerous. Reasonable suspicion exists when the information known to the member of the service would make an ordinarily prudent and cautious police officer under the circumstances believe

Page 5

criminal activity is at hand. The officer must have a particularized and objective basis for suspecting the person stopped of the criminal conduct. NYPD Patrol Guide, Procedure 212-11.

§ 87(2)(g)					
<u>Civilian</u>	and Officer CCRB Histories				
_	• This is the first CCRB complaint to which §87(2)(b) has been a party (BR 06).				
•	ervice for four years and this is the fire	rst CCRB			
complaint to which he has been a s					
	of-service for five years and this is the	e first CCRB			
complaint to which he has been a s	subject.				
Mediation (Civil and Criminal Histories				
<u>Mediation, v</u>	Civil and Crimmai Histories				
• §87(2)(b) declined to mediate t	his complaint				
• [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]					
	k City Office of the Comptroller has	no record of a			
Notice of Claim being filed in rega	ards to this complaint (BR 08).				
Squad No.:15					
54uau 110 <u>15</u>					
Investigator:					
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date			
 					
Squad Leader:					
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date			

Page 6

Reviewer:			
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Page 7